

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- **BLACK BORDERS**
- **TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- **FADED TEXT**
- **ILLEGIBLE TEXT**
- **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- **COLORED PHOTOS**
- **BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS**
- **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------|
| 09/931,599 | 08/16/2001 | C.W. Luttrell | REEL:0021--2/YOD 99RE166- | 3929 |
| 7590 | 12/02/2003 | | EXAMINER | |
| Alexander Gerasimow Allen-Bradley Company Patent Dept., 704P Floor 8 T29 1201 South Second Street Milwaukee, WI 53204 | | | TUGBANG, ANTHONY D | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3729 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 12/02/2003 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/931,599 | LUTTRELL, C.W. |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| A. Dexter Tugbang | 3729 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 20-54 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 20-33 and 48-54 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 34,37-41 and 44-47 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 35,36,42 and 43 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of the invention of Group III, Claims 34-47 in Paper No. 3 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).
2. Claims 20-33 and 48-54 have been withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 4.

Specification

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract is not directed to the claimed invention, i.e. the claimed manufacturing process. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).
4. Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
- (2) if an article, its method of making;
- (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
- (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
- (5) if a process, the steps.**

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

5. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: A Method of Making an Electric Motor Stator Assembly having a Novel Winding Arrangement.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 34, 37, 38, 41, 44 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Linkous 3,333,329.

Regarding Claim 34, Linkous discloses a method of making an electrical motor stator comprising: inserting a first coil group 33 capable of being used for a first electrical phase via an insertion tool or a machine (see col. 4, lines 38-44); inserting a first coil group 34 capable of being used for a second electrical phase; inserting a first coil group 35 capable of being used for a third electrical phase; inserting a second coil group 38 capable of being used for the first electrical phase; inserting a second coil group 39 capable of being used for the second electrical

phase; and inserting a second coil group 40 capable of being used for the third electrical phase.

In Figure 1, Linkous shows that each of the coil groups are inserted and extend from both a front end and a back end of the stator core in which the back end is opposite to the front end. This front end and back end can be broadly read as the claimed “first end” and “second end”, respectively, where each of the coil groups is inserted by the insertion tool through each of the front end and the back end. It is noted that the first, second and third electrical phases are recited as functional language that does not provide any manipulative difference to the claimed manufacturing method.

Regarding Claim 41, the recitations of the claimed “first” through “sixth” coil groups are similarly recited in Claim 34 with the claimed “first coil” groups and “second coil” groups. Each claim requires six coil groups and accordingly, the coil groups 33-35 and 38-40 can alternatively be read as being equivalent to the claimed “first” through “sixth” coil groups, respectively.

Regarding Claims 37 and 44, each coil group comprises individual leads 16 which exit the stator core from both the first and second ends.

Regarding Claims 38 and 45, each coil group of Linkous includes multiple windings of individual leads 16 that are disposed singularly in one winding slot with a plurality of windings of leads 16 disposed in other winding slots shared with windings of a different coil group (see Fig 3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 39, 40, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linkous in view of Kawamura et al 5,231,324.

Linkous discloses the claimed manufacturing method as previously discussed and further including at least one example of a two-pole stator (see col. 4, line 38). Linkous does not teach that each coil group has two windings disposed singularly in a respective winding slot and four windings disposed in respective winding slots shared with windings of a different coil to form a three-phase stator, or a stator having first, second and third phases.

Kawamura a winding arrangement in a number of different embodiments, all of which are to manufacture a three-phase stator, with each coil group having more than one winding disposed in a respective winding slot and at least four other windings disposed in respective winding slots shared with windings of different or other coil groups (see at least the examples of Figs. 16, 17 and 24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the method of Linkous by utilizing the winding arrangement taught by Kawamura, to produce an art recognized equivalent electrical motor stator having three-phases, i.e. first, second and third, phases, with at least two poles.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claims 35, 36, 42 and 43 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to A. Dexter Tugbang whose telephone number is 703-308-7599. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:00 am - 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on 703-308-1789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9302.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0858.



A. Dexter Tugbang
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3729

November 26, 2003